

wrote the First Amendment. The press, after all, is the one institution that the Founding Fathers permanently protected so that reporters could be a check on the abuse of power.

And it is impossible to imagine that what the founders had in mind when they wrote the impeachment clause is that a president could be brought down by that prosecutor and by that press corps, all because a Linda Tripp had a Lucianne Goldberg got an intern to talk into a tapped phone about sex so they could put together a book deal.

So far, it seems that the American people understand this, even if the press doesn't.

So maybe it's the press that needs to draw lessons from Pressgate, not its customers. Or maybe the customers can force these lessons on the press by being more skeptical of the product that is peddled to them. I have three such lessons in mind:

First, consumers of the press should ignore all publications or newscasts that try to foist the term "sources" on them unaccompanied by any qualifiers or explanation. The number of sources should be specified (is it two or 20?) and the knowledge, perspective, and bias of those sources should be described, even if the source cannot be named. (Is it a cab driver or a cabinet officer, a defense lawyer or a prosecutor?)

Second, no one should read or listen to a media organization that reports on another news outlet's reporting of anything significant and negative without doing its own verification.

And, third, no one should read or listen to any media outlet that consistently shows that it is the lapdog of big, official power rather than a respectful skeptic.

The big power here is Ken Starr. Prosecutors usually are in crime stories, and the independent counsel's power is unprecedented.

This is what makes Pressgate—the media's performance in the lead-up to the Lewinsky story and in the first weeks of it—a true scandal, a true instance of an institution being corrupted to its core. For the competition for scoops to toss out into a frenzied, high-tech news cycle seems to have so bewitched almost everyone that the press eagerly let the man in power write the story—once Linda Tripp and Lucianne Goldberg put it together for him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes. (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCARBOROUGH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. RUSH addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CHENOWETH addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

COLUMBIA JOURNALISM REVIEW ARTICLE "WHERE WE WENT WRONG . . . AND WHAT WE DO NOW"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, it is coincidental that my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, was here just a few moments ago and entered into the RECORD the article by Stephen Brill which appeared in Brill's Content, the Independent Voice of the Information Age, which talks about Pressgate.

In that article, Mr. Brill says on the cover, "In Watergate, reporters checked abuse of power. In the Lewinsky affair, they enabled it; that is, the press enabled abuse of power by lapping up Ken Starr's leaks, which he now admits for the first time, the inside story day by day. Mr. CONYERS just entered that article into the RECORD.

I would like to take this opportunity to draw the attention of the Members of the House and anyone else who is interested in this issue to the March-April edition of Columbia Journalism Review. I do so because, unfortunately, Mr. Brill's article has been attacked. It has been attacked most vociferously by the Independent Counsel and the apologists for the Independent Counsel, Mr. Starr.

However, objective analysis of Mr. Brill's article shows that in spite of the attacks against it, the article stands up very well and reveals quite clearly the abuse of power engaged in by the Independent Counsel in this particular investigation.

The Independent Counsel, it appears, and it is shown by Mr. Brill's article, engaged in a conscious series of leaks of misinformation to the press over a prolonged period of time. Now, if additional substantiation is needed going beyond Mr. Brill's report, that additional substantiation can be found to a remarkable degree in that March-April edition of the Columbia Journalism Review.

The article in Columbia Journalism Review, and it is a cover story, is entitled "Where We Went Wrong," and it is an examination of the press coverage of the so-called events that the prosecutor is allegedly looking into.

I would like to read a few brief excerpts from the story in the Columbia Journalism Review and then enter the entire article in the RECORD.

The article says, in part, "But the explosive nature of the story, and the speed with which it burst upon the consciousness of the Nation, triggered in the early stages a Piranha-like frenzy in pursuit of the relatively few tidbits tossed into the journalistic waters—by whom," the story asks?

"That there were wholesale leaks from lawyers and investigators was evident, but either legal restraints or reportorial pledges of anonymity kept the public from knowing with any certainty the sources of key elements in the saga."

The story goes on: "Not just the volume but the methodology of the reporting came in for sharp criticism—often more rumor-mongering than fact-getting and fact-checking, and unattributed approbation of the work and speculation of others. The old yardstick said to have been applied by the Post in the Watergate story, that every revelation had to be confirmed by two sources before publication, was summarily abandoned by many news outlets," and no wonder, because they thought they were getting the information from the horse's mouth, from Mr. Starr and his investigators.

The story goes on: "As often as not, reports were published or broadcast without a single source named or mentioned in an attribution so vague as to be worthless. Readers and listeners were told repeatedly that this or that information came from "sources", a word that at best conveyed only the notion that the information was not pure fiction or fantasy. As leaks flew wildly from these unspecified sources, the American public was left, as seldom before in a major news event, to guess where stories came from and why.

"Readers and listeners were told what was reported to be included in affidavits and depositions . . . or presented to Independent Counsel Starr. Leakers were violating the rules while the public was left to guess about their identity and about the truth of what was passed on to them through the news media, often without the customary tests of validity."

Of course, the story goes on.

I include this article for the RECORD, Mr. Chairman. We will take other opportunities to talk more about this in the future.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the Columbia Journalism Review, Mar./Apr. 1998]

WHERE WE WENT WRONG

(By Jules Witcover)

In the sex scandal story that has cast a cloud over the president, Bill Clinton does not stand to be the only loser. No matter how it turns out, another will be the American news media, whose reputation as truth-teller to the country has been besmirched by perceptions, in and out of the news business, about how the story has been reported.

The indictment is too sweeping. Many news outlets have acted with considerable responsibility, especially after the first few frantic days, considering the initial public pressure for information, the burden of obtaining much of it from sealed documents in